



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/866,607	05/30/2001	Tomoharu Umekawa	Q64367	5522
7590 09/23/2004			EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			ROBINSON, GRETA L.	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	OC 20037-3213		2177	
			DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/866,607	UMEKAWA, TOMOHARU
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Greta L. Robinson	2177
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 18 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period cee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offi imely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFI		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) 🗌 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note by	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejec	tion(s):	•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 		eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims were appeared to the control of the control		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ž.
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Exantiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme		GRETA ROBINSON PRIMARY EXAMINER
		Greta Robinson Primary Examiner September 21, 2004

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Feibelman et al. teaches a data provision device for providing a user with data note communication device interface element 40 figure 1. Feibelman et al. provides for the limitation "determination means" note provisioning device engine 30, figure 1, "data transmission means" see figure 2, I/O ports, and "transmission means" note figure 3 element 35. Also Feibelman et al. teaches a charge process note order database (32) of figure 3 and information acquisition means element 32 figure 3. Applicant's argument that Feilbelman et al. does not address the present inventions prior art problem of the aviodance of duplicating delivery of orders is not a limitation of the present claims. Feibelman et al's provides for the limitation "a transaction process is completed" through the provisioning script based upon rules see column 6 lines 5-9 and lines 22-56.